REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed April 29, 2008. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1 – 20 remain pending. In particular, Applicants amend claims 1, 3 – 7, 10, and 13. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Claim 1 is Allowable Over *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin*

The Office Action indicates that claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,069,889 ("*Feldman*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0014665 ("*Anderson*") and U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0147916 ("*Strongin*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. More specifically, claim 1 recites:

> A secure data switching node comprising:
> a. a plurality of communications ports;
> b. a switching database having a plurality of switching entries, each one of the plurality of switching entries specifying an association between one or more data network node identifiers and one or more respective communications ports;
> c. a plurality of switching entry protection flags, corresponding to the plurality of switching entries, each of the plurality of switching entry protection flags configured with a predetermined value that determines whether each of the switching entries is protected from update; and
> d. a controller executing a secure switching database update process, for at least one of the switching entries, wherein executing a secure switching database update process includes determining, from at least one of the switching entry protection flags, whether the at least one of the switching entries is protected from update and ***receiving a modification instruction including a change of at least one of the respective communications ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***, whereby an attempt by a hostile data network node to effect a modification of the at least one communication port of a protected switching entry is prevented when the protection flag is set, enabling the data switching node to operate securely concurrently in friendly and hostile data networking environments.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Feldman*, *Anderson*, and *Strongin*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "secure data switching node comprising... a controller executing a secure switching database update process, for at least one of the switching entries, wherein executing a secure switching database update process includes determining, from at least one of the switching entry protection flags, whether the at least one of the switching entries is protected from update and ***receiving a modification instruction including a change of at least one of the respective communications ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 1, as amended. More specifically, *Feldman* discloses "an apparatus and method for secure, automated response to distributed denial of service attacks" (page 2, paragraph [0025]). However, *Feldman* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of at least one of the respective communications ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Additionally, *Anderson* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman*. More specifically, *Anderson* discloses an "upstream router [that] will receive the one or more squelch filters and verify that the one or more filters select only network traffic directed to the downstream device" (page 2, paragraph [0026]). However, *Anderson* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of at least one of the respective communications ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 1, as amended.

Further, *Strongin* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman* and *Anderson*. More specifically, *Strongin* discloses "a read/write protection table based on physical addresses of the memory" (page 4, paragraph [0046]). However, *Strongin* fails to even suggest "***receiving a***

modification instruction including a change of at least one of the respective communications ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers..." as recited in claim 1, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 1, as amended, is allowable.

II. Claim 3 is Allowable Over *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin*

The Office Action indicates that claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,069,889 ("*Feldman*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0014665 ("*Anderson*") and U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0147916 ("*Strongin*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 3. More specifically, claim 3 recites:

> A secure data switching node comprising:
> a. a plurality of physical communications ports;
> b. a switching database having a plurality of switching entries, each one of the plurality of switching entries specifying an association between one or more data network node identifiers and one or more of the respective physical communications ports;
> c. a plurality of topology discovery disable flags corresponding to the plurality of switching entries, each of the plurality of topology discovery disable flags configured with a predetermined value that determines whether additional switching entries are prevented from being added to the switching database; and
> d. a controller executing a secure data transport network topology update process for at least one of the switching entries, wherein executing a secure data transport network topology update includes determining, from at least one of the topology discovery disable flags, whether switching entries are prevented from being added to the switching database and ***receiving an addition instruction including a change of at least one of the respective communications ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***, whereby attempts by a hostile data network node to effect at least one addition of a switching entry specifying a communications port associated with a topology discovery disabled physical communications port are prevented, enabling the data switching node to operate securely concurrently in friendly and hostile data networking environments.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Feldman*, *Anderson*, and *Strongin*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "secure data switching node comprising... a controller executing a secure data transport network topology update process for at least one of the switching entries, wherein executing a secure data transport network topology update includes determining, from at least one of the topology discovery disable flags, whether switching entries are prevented from being added to the switching database and ***receiving an addition instruction including a change of at least one of the respective communications ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 3, as amended. More specifically, *Feldman* discloses "an apparatus and method for secure, automated response to distributed denial of service attacks" (page 2, paragraph [0025]). However, *Feldman* fails to even suggest "***receiving an addition instruction including a change of at least one of the respective communications ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 3, as amended.

Additionally, *Anderson* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman*. More specifically, *Anderson* discloses an "upstream router [that] will receive the one or more squelch filters and verify that the one or more filters select only network traffic directed to the downstream device" (page 2, paragraph [0026]). However, *Anderson* fails to even suggest "***receiving an addition instruction including a change of at least one of the respective communications ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 3, as amended.

Further, *Strongin* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman* and *Anderson*. More specifically, *Strongin* discloses "a read/write protection table based on physical addresses of the memory" (page 4, paragraph [0046]). However, *Strongin* fails to even suggest "***receiving an addition instruction including a change of at least one of the respective communications***

ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers..." as recited in claim 3, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 3, as amended, is allowable.

III. Claim 4 is Allowable Over *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin*

The Office Action indicates that claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,069,889 ("*Feldman*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0014665 ("*Anderson*") and U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0147916 ("*Strongin*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 4. More specifically, claim 4 recites:

> A secure data switching node comprising:
> a. a plurality of physical communications ports;
> b. a switching database having a plurality of switching entries, each one of the plurality of switching entries specifying an association between a data network node identifier and a communications port;
> c. a plurality of topology discovery disable flags, corresponding to the plurality of switching entries, each of the plurality of topology discovery disable flags configured with a predetermined value that determines whether additional switching entries are prevented from being added to the switching database;
> d. a global unknown destination flood control flag; and
> e. a controller implementing a secure Payload Data Unit (PDU) forwarding process, ***the PDU forwarding process including a modification instruction including a change of at least one communication port for at least one of the data network node identifiers***, a received PDU having a destination data node identifier not stored in the switching database is replicated only to physical communications ports having reset topology discovery disable flags preventing hostile data network nodes connected thereto from listening to unknown destination data traffic, wherein implementing a secure Payload Data Unit (PDU) forwarding process includes determining, from at least one of the topology discovery disable flags, whether switching entries are prevented from being added to the switching database.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Feldman*, *Anderson*, and *Strongin*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "secure data switching node comprising... a controller implementing a secure Payload Data Unit (PDU) forwarding process, ***the PDU forwarding process including a modification instruction including a change of at least one communication port for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 4, as amended. More specifically, *Feldman* discloses "an apparatus and method for secure, automated response to distributed denial of service attacks" (page 2, paragraph [0025]). However, *Feldman* fails to even suggest a "***PDU forwarding process including a modification instruction including a change of at least one communication port for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 4, as amended.

Additionally, *Anderson* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman*. More specifically, *Anderson* discloses an "upstream router [that] will receive the one or more squelch filters and verify that the one or more filters select only network traffic directed to the downstream device" (page 2, paragraph [0026]). However, *Anderson* fails to even suggest a "***PDU forwarding process including a modification instruction including a change of at least one communication port for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 4, as amended.

Further, *Strongin* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman* and *Anderson*. More specifically, *Strongin* discloses "a read/write protection table based on physical addresses of the memory" (page 4, paragraph [0046]). However, *Strongin* fails to even suggest a "***PDU forwarding process including a modification instruction including a change of at least one communication port for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 4, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 4, as amended, is allowable.

IV. Claim 5 is Allowable Over *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin*

The Office Action indicates that claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,069,889 ("*Feldman*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0014665 ("*Anderson*") and U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0147916 ("*Strongin*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 5. More specifically, claim 5 recites:

> A secure data switching node comprising:
> a. a plurality of physical communications ports;
> b. a switching database having a plurality of switching entries, each one of the plurality of switching entries specifying an association between at least one data network node identifier and at least one of the communications ports;
> c. a plurality of unknown destination flood control flags, corresponding to the plurality of switching entries, each of the plurality of unknown destination flood control flags configured with a predetermined value that determines whether replication of Payload Data Unit (PDU) to communication ports is prevented; and
> d. a controller implementing a secure Payload Data Unit (PDU) forwarding process, wherein implementing a secure Payload Data Unit (PDU) forwarding process includes determining, from at least one of the unknown destination flood control flags, whether replication of PDU to communication ports is prevented, the ***PDU forwarding process further including receiving a modification instruction including a change of at least one of the communication ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***, whereby a received PDU having as a destination data node identifier not stored in the switching database is replicated only to physical communications ports having reset unknown destination flood control flags preventing hostile data network nodes connected thereto from listening to unknown destination data traffic.
> ***(Emphasis added).***

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Feldman*, *Anderson*, and *Strongin*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "secure data switching node comprising... a controller implementing a secure Payload Data Unit (PDU) forwarding process, wherein

implementing a secure Payload Data Unit (PDU) forwarding process includes determining, from at least one of the unknown destination flood control flags, whether replication of PDU to communication ports is prevented, the ***PDU forwarding process further including receiving a modification instruction including a change of at least one of the communication ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 5, as amended. More specifically, *Feldman* discloses "an apparatus and method for secure, automated response to distributed denial of service attacks" (page 2, paragraph [0025]). However, *Feldman* fails to even suggest a "***PDU forwarding process further including receiving a modification instruction including a change of at least one of the communication ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 5, as amended.

Additionally, *Anderson* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman*. More specifically, *Anderson* discloses an "upstream router [that] will receive the one or more squelch filters and verify that the one or more filters select only network traffic directed to the downstream device" (page 2, paragraph [0026]). However, *Anderson* fails to even suggest a "***PDU forwarding process further including receiving a modification instruction including a change of at least one of the communication ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 5, as amended.

Further, *Strongin* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman* and *Anderson*. More specifically, *Strongin* discloses "a read/write protection table based on physical addresses of the memory" (page 4, paragraph [0046]). However, *Strongin* fails to even suggest a "***PDU forwarding process further including receiving a modification instruction including a change of at least one of the communication ports for at least one of the data network node identifiers***..." as recited in claim 5, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 5, as amended, is allowable.

V. Claim 6 is Allowable Over *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin*

The Office Action indicates that claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,069,889 ("*Feldman*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0014665 ("*Anderson*") and U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0147916 ("*Strongin*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 6. More specifically, claim 6 recites:

> A method of securely updating a switching database of a data switching node forwarding data traffic in a data transport network, the method comprising steps of:
>
> a. extracting a source data network node identifier from data traffic received on a source physical communications port of the data switching node;
>
> b. querying the switching database having a plurality of switching entries, each one of the plurality of switching entries specifying an association between a data network node identifier and a communications port, the query using the extracted source data network identifier as a key, the switching database including a field for indicating a predetermined value associated with the source data network node identifier configured to indicate whether a new switching entry is prevented from being added to the switching database;
>
> c. ***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***;
>
> d. adding a new switching entry to the switching database if a switching entry corresponding to the source data network node identifier does not prevent entry to the switching database; and
>
> e. modifying the communications port specification of a switching entry found to correspond to the extracted source data network node identifier, if a switching entry protection flag associated with the found switching entry is reset whereby preventing a redirection of data traffic processed by the data switching node.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Feldman*, *Anderson*, and *Strongin*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "method of securely updating a switching

database of a data switching node forwarding data traffic in a data transport network, the method comprising steps of... ***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 6, as amended. More specifically, *Feldman* discloses "an apparatus and method for secure, automated response to distributed denial of service attacks" (page 2, paragraph [0025]). However, *Feldman* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 6, as amended.

Additionally, *Anderson* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman*. More specifically, *Anderson* discloses an "upstream router [that] will receive the one or more squelch filters and verify that the one or more filters select only network traffic directed to the downstream device" (page 2, paragraph [0026]). However, *Anderson* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 6, as amended.

Further, *Strongin* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman* and *Anderson*. More specifically, *Strongin* discloses "a read/write protection table based on physical addresses of the memory" (page 4, paragraph [0046]). However, *Strongin* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 6, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 6, as amended, is allowable.

VI. Claim 7 is Allowable Over *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin*

The Office Action indicates that claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,069,889 ("*Feldman*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0014665 ("*Anderson*") and U.S. Patent Publication Number

2002/0147916 ("*Strongin*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 7. More specifically, claim 7 recites:

> A method of securely updating data transport network topology information held in a switching database of a data switching node associated with the data transport network, the method comprising steps of:
>
> a. extracting a source data network node identifier from data traffic received on a source physical communications port of the data switching node;
>
> b. querying the switching database having a plurality of switching entries, each one of the plurality of switching entries specifying an association between a data network node identifier and a communications port, the query using the extracted source data network node identifier as a key, the switching database including a field for indicating a predetermined value associated with a topology discovery disable flag configured to indicate whether switching entries are prevented from being added to the switching database; and
>
> c. ***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***;
>
> d. adding a new switching entry to the switching database if a switching entry corresponding to the source data network node identifier is not found in the switching database and the topology discovery disable flag is reset whereby a hostile data network node is prevented from connecting to the source physical communications port.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Feldman*, *Anderson*, and *Strongin*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "method of securely updating data transport network topology information held in a switching database of a data switching node associated with the data transport network, the method comprising steps of... ***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 7, as amended. More specifically, *Feldman* discloses "an apparatus and method for secure, automated response to distributed denial of service attacks" (page 2, paragraph [0025]). However, *Feldman* fails to even suggest "***receiving a***

modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier as recited in claim 7, as amended.

Additionally, *Anderson* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman*. More specifically, *Anderson* discloses an "upstream router [that] will receive the one or more squelch filters and verify that the one or more filters select only network traffic directed to the downstream device" (page 2, paragraph [0026]). However, *Anderson* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 7, as amended.

Further, *Strongin* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman* and *Anderson*. More specifically, *Strongin* discloses "a read/write protection table based on physical addresses of the memory" (page 4, paragraph [0046]). However, *Strongin* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 7, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 7, as amended, is allowable.

VII. Claim 10 is Allowable Over *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin*

The Office Action indicates that claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,069,889 ("*Feldman*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0014665 ("*Anderson*") and U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0147916 ("*Strongin*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 10. More specifically, claim 10 recites:

> A secure method of forwarding data traffic having a destination unknown to a data switching node, the method comprising steps of:
>
> a. extracting a source data network node identifier from the unknown destination data traffic received on a source physical communications port of the data switching node;

b. querying the switching database having a plurality of switching entries each one of the plurality of switching entries specifying an association between a data network node identifier and a communications port, the query using the extracted source data network node identifier as a key, the switching database including a field for indicating a predetermined value associated with a global unknown destination flood control flag configured to indicate whether replication of PDU to communication ports is prevented;

c. ***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***;

d. replicating the received data traffic to each one of a plurality of physical communications ports of the data switching node if the global unknown destination flood control flag associated with the data switching node is reset; and

e. replicating the received data traffic to each one of the plurality of physical communications ports except physical communications ports having a topology discovery disable feature set if the global unknown destination flood control flag is set whereby a hostile data network node connected to a physical communications port having the topology discovery disable flag set is prevented from spying on unknown destination data traffic.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Feldman*, *Anderson*, and *Strongin*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "secure method of forwarding data traffic having a destination unknown to a data switching node, the method comprising steps of... ***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 10, as amended. More specifically, *Feldman* discloses "an apparatus and method for secure, automated response to distributed denial of service attacks" (page 2, paragraph [0025]). However, *Feldman* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 10, as amended.

Additionally, *Anderson* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman*. More specifically, *Anderson* discloses an "upstream router [that] will receive the one or more squelch filters and verify that the one or more filters select only network traffic directed to the downstream device"

(page 2, paragraph [0026]). However, *Anderson* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 10, as amended.

Further, *Strongin* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman* and *Anderson*. More specifically, *Strongin* discloses "a read/write protection table based on physical addresses of the memory" (page 4, paragraph [0046]). However, *Strongin* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 10, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 10, as amended, is allowable.

VIII. Claim 13 is Allowable Over *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin*

The Office Action indicates that claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,069,889 ("*Feldman*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0014665 ("*Anderson*") and U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0147916 ("*Strongin*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 13. More specifically, claim 13 recites:

> A secure method of forwarding data traffic having a destination unknown to a data switching node, the method comprising steps of:
>
> a. extracting a source data network node identifier from the unknown destination data traffic received on a source physical communications port of the data switching node;
>
> b. querying the switching database having a plurality of switching entries each one of the plurality of switching entries specifying an association between a data network node identifier and a communications port, the query using the extracted source data network node identifier as a key, the switching database including a field for indicating a predetermined value associated with an unknown destination flood control flag configured to indicate whether replication of PDU to communication ports is prevented;

c. ***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***;

d. replicating the received data traffic to each one of a plurality of communications ports of the data switching node if the unknown destination flood control flags associated with the physical communications ports are reset; and

d. replicating the received data traffic to each one of the plurality of physical communications ports except physical communications ports having the unknown destination flood control flag set, whereby a hostile data network node connected to a physical communications port having the associated topology discovery disable flag set is prevented from spying on unknown destination data traffic.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for at least the reason that none of *Feldman*, *Anderson*, and *Strongin*, taken alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests a "secure method of forwarding data traffic having a destination unknown to a data switching node, the method comprising steps of... ***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 13, as amended. More specifically, *Feldman* discloses "an apparatus and method for secure, automated response to distributed denial of service attacks" (page 2, paragraph [0025]). However, *Feldman* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 13, as amended.

Additionally, *Anderson* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman*. More specifically, *Anderson* discloses an "upstream router [that] will receive the one or more squelch filters and verify that the one or more filters select only network traffic directed to the downstream device" (page 2, paragraph [0026]). However, *Anderson* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 13, as amended.

Further, *Strongin* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Feldman* and *Anderson*. More specifically, *Strongin* discloses "a read/write protection table based on physical addresses of the memory" (page 4, paragraph [0046]). However, *Strongin* fails to even suggest "***receiving a modification instruction including a change of the communication port for the data network node identifier***" as recited in claim 13, as amended. For at least these reasons, claim 13, as amended, is allowable.

IX. Claims 11 – 12 and 14 are Allowable Over *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin*

The Office Action indicates that claims 11 – 12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,069,889 ("*Feldman*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0014665 ("*Anderson*") and U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0147916 ("*Strongin*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 11 – 12 and 14. More specifically, dependent claims 11 – 12 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 10. Dependent claim 14 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 13. *In re Fine*, *Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

X. Claim 2 is Allowable Over *Feldman* in view of *Anderson*, *Strongin*, and *Civanlar*

The Office Action indicates that claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,069,889 ("*Feldman*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0014665 ("*Anderson*"), U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0147916 ("*Strongin*"), and U.S. Patent Number 5,996,021 ("*Civanlar*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and

Strongin fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 2. More specifically, dependent claim 2 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 1. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

XI. Claims 8 – 9 are Allowable Over *Feldman* in view of *Anderson, Strongin,* and *Lubarsky*

The Office Action indicates that claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,069,889 ("*Feldman*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0014665 ("*Anderson*"), U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0147916 ("*Strongin*"), and U.S. Patent Number 4,893,340 ("*Lubarsky*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 8 – 9. More specifically, dependent claims 8 – 9 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 7. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

XII. Claims 15 – 20 are Allowable Over *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin*

The Office Action indicates that claims 15 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,069,889 ("*Feldman*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication Number 2003/0014665 ("*Anderson*"), U.S. Patent Publication Number 2002/0147916 ("*Strongin*"), and U.S. Patent Number 7,065,644 ("*Danielf*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Feldman* in view of *Anderson* and *Strongin* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claims 15 – 20. More specifically, dependent claim 15 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 1. Dependent claim 16 is believed to be allowable

for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 3. Dependent claim 17 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 4. Dependent claim 18 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 5. Dependent claim 19 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 6. Dependent claim 20 is believed to be allowable for at least the reason that this claim depends from allowable independent claim 7. *In re Fine*, *Minnesota Mining and Mfg.Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/afb/
Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway S.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500